

Town of Mount Pleasant Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment Agenda

Mount Pleasant Town Hall 8590 Park Drive Monday, September 19, 2011 - 7:00pm

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Swearing-In of Appointed Member
- 3. Recognition of Quorum
- 4. Approval of Agenda
- 5. Approval of Minutes
- 6. Planning Board Cases
 - (a) TA 2011-04

Text Amendment to Table 4.6-1 of the UDO to add Upper Story Dwellings as a permitted use in the Center City zoning district and add a definition to Appendix A for Upper Story Dwellings.

7. Board of Adjustment Cases

None

- 8. Other Business.
 - (a) Staff Report

Presentation of Planning Staff activities for the Months of July and August.

(b) Work Session

Discussion of growth and development policies - continued from July 2011 meeting.

10. Adjourn

Mount Pleasant

— North Carolina

Founded in 1848

Town of Mount Pleasant Planning and Zoning Meeting September 19, 2011 7:00 P.M.

Members Present:

James Senecal, John Murdock, Mike Steiner,

Shirley Freeman, Whit Moose, Jr., Margaret Strickland.

Staff Present:

Town Administrator Adrian Cox, Planner from Benchmark

Vagn Hansen, Clerk to Board Joy Eudy.

Call to Order:

Chairman John Murdock called the meeting to order.

Swearing in of New Member:

Michael Steiner was sworn in as a new member to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Quorum:

Chairman Murdock stated that a Quorum was present.

Approval of Agenda:

Chairman Murdock entertained a motion to approve the agenda. Board member Whit Moose, Jr. made a motion to approve the agenda. Board member James Senecal seconded the motion with all board members in favor. 5-0.

Approval of Minutes;

Chairman Murdock entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the August 8, 2011. Board member Whit Moose, Jr. made a motion to accept the minutes with a change made to the signature of the minutes. Board member Shirley Freeman seconded the motion with all board members in favor. 5-0.

Planning Board Case;

TA 2011-04

Text Amendment to Table 4.6-1 of the UDO to add Upper Story Dwellings as permitted use in the Center City zoning district and add a definition to Appendix A for Upper Story Dwellings.

8590 Park Drive: P.O. Box 787: Mount Pleasant, North Carolina 28124: tel. 704.436.9803: fax 704.436.2921

Board member Whit Moose, Jr. stated he has a business downtown that could be considered in this Text Amendment and wanted to know if he should be abstained from the discussion.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated he saw no problems with Whit Moose, Jr. being involved in the discussion. All Board members agreed they had no problems with him being involved in the discussion.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated the proposed Text Amendment is intended to provide clarity and eliminate an inconsistency that currently exists in the UDO with regard to the status of upper story dwelling units in the Center City zoning district. Vagn Hansen stated the Table of Permitted Uses does not explicitly allow dwelling units above the first floor in nonresidential structures in the Center City district.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated there are provisions for residences in the Center City district, but the lack of clarity with regards to this particular arrangement could hamper future development in Mount Pleasant's downtown area. Vagn Hansen stated this is in contrast to a statement in Section 11.5.1.12, which sets forth design regulations for the CC district, which states that such dwellings are permitted above the first story of a nonresidential building in the district. The existence of this conflict could lead to future debate if such dwellings are proposed as part of new development or the rehabilitation of an existing building.

Vagn Hansen stated it is proposed that Table 4.6-1 be amended to add a new use to the Table of Permitted Uses for Upper Story Dwellings, which will be allowed as a use by right in the CC district.

Vagn Hansen stated if the Board wishes to expand the number of districts that this will be allowed and the Board may make suggestion to do so. The Staff feels that making this clarification for the CC district is the most pressing concern at this time.

He stated it is proposed that a definition for the Upper Story Dwelling be added to the definitions in Appendix A and it would read (One or more dwelling units, intended for permanent residential occupancy, established above the first story of a structure that contains commercial or other nonresidential space on the first story of the structure.)

Vagn Hansen stated the addition of the use to the Table of Permitted Uses and the addition of the proposed definition to Appendix A will provide clarity to the intent of the ordinance with respect to this type of use, and prevent future conflict about the propriety of establishing new upper story dwelling units in Mount Pleasant's downtown area.

Board member Mike Steiner asked the question if the upper story could be used for business also. Vagn Hansen stated it could be used for businesses.

After a small amount of discussion, Chairman Murdock stated the Board needed to vote to make a recommendation to the Town Board regarding the proposed UDO Text Amendment. He stated the Board needed to provide a statement of consistency with the recommendation.

Board member Whit Moose, Jr. made a motion to recommend to the Town Board, the Text Amendment TA 2011-04 – Amendment to Table 4.6-1 of Permitted Uses to add Upper Story Dwelling as a Permitted Use in the CC District and add a definition for Upper Story Dwellings in Appendix A. Whit Moose, Jr. stated it is consistent with the general plan and policies of the Town of Mount Pleasant. Board member James Senecal seconded the motion with all board members in favor. 5-0

Staff Report: Month of July and August:

Temporary Sign Permit:

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated a TS 2011-01, Temporary sign permit had been issused to Dance Trap located at 8345 West Franklin Street for 30 days ending on August 25th.

Zoning Verification Letter:

A zoning verification letter was prepared at the request of the proprietor of Top Caliber, a firearms dealer that plans to open soon at 7995 West Franklin Street.

UDO Text Amendment:

Vagn Hansen stated the Town Board adopted the following Text Amendments to the UDO at their June $27^{\rm th}$ meeting.

Text Amendment TA 2011-02, an amendment to clarify provisions of the outdoor lighting ordinance, and transfer those provisions from the separate appendix where they are currently located to Article11 – Site Design Standards.

Text Amendment TA 2011-03, an amendment to Section 5.2 of the ordinance, which will provide additional standards for accessory structures and uses, particularly related to accessory structures on nonresidential properties.

Open Zoning Violation Cases:

Vagn Hansen stated at 7921 West Franklin Street there is an illegal sign and an unpermitted business in a residential zoning district. He stated the property owner had been notified, but there has been no response to the notice.

Open Code Enforcement Cases:

8543 Circle Drive - Junk Cars 5510 NC Highway 73 East - Tall grass violations

Code Enforcement Cases Resolved:

8059 West Franklin Street - Junk Cars

1625 Short Street - Tall grass 2 violations

8517 Lee Street - Tall grass

1495 South Main Street - Tall grass

1493 South Main Street - Tall grass

8929 East Franklin Street - Tall grass

1546 Barringer Street - Tall grass

Alternate member Margaret Strickland asked if the picnic tables at the What-a-Burger were in compliance with the Town Ordinance. Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated they had looked into this issue and said there is nothing saying the tables cannot be there.

Work Session:

Discussion of growth and development policies - continued from July 2011 meeting.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated, following the Town Administrator's presentation at the May meeting regarding to the Town's current infrastructure and plans for potential infrastructure expansions, we are now moving into the discussion of potential policies that could be adopted to help guide Town staff, the Planning Board, and Town Board as future decisions are made regarding the growth of the Town and how it will develop. Staff wanted something that we can be comfortable with.

Based on the input from the Planning Board at the June and July meetings, a number of revisions to the proposed policies have been made. The primary change has been to propose a new set of evaluation criteria for annexations than the previous evaluation policy.

Evaluation Criteria for Annexations:

The following are seven categories of criteria that have been proposed for evaluation of future annexation. These differ from the more rigid criteria that were previously proposed in that they are less exclusive and only provide relative guidance on the degree of favorability of a proposed annexation. It has now been expanded to include both contiguous and noncontiguous annexations in order to provide better

guidance to the Planning Board as it evaluates all annexations for recommendations to the Town Board.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated that in each category, various scenarios are presented for evaluation. He said an annexation would be judged based on the degree of favorability that it receives in response to each of the criteria. Subjective judgments regarding the favorability of annexations in other aspects, such as economic development potential, tax base, general desirability, etc. have been excluded from the list since these will vary greatly from annexation to annexation and should be judged independently from these other criteria which pertain more to the ability of the Town to provide services and expand its boundaries in an orderly manner that promotes sound growth.

A. Contiguity

Contiguous to primary corporate limits - Most Favorable

Noncontiguous within ETJ but contiguous with other satellite area – More Favorable

Noncontiguous but within ETJ - Favorable

Noncontiguous outside of ETJ - Least Favorable

B. Noncontiguous Distance

Within short distance of primary corporate limits (less than .5 miles) – Most Favorable)

Within greater distance of primary corporate limits (0.5-1 mile) Favorable

Within long distance of primary corporate limits (1-2 miles) - Less Favorable

Within very long distance of primary corporate limits (2-3 miles) - Least Favorable

C. Noncontiguous Distance to Existing Satellite Area

Contiguous with satellite area - Most Favorable

Within short distance of satellite area (less than .25 miles) - Favorable

Longer distance from satellite area (greater than .25 miles) – No Effect on Favorability

D. Size of Proposed Area

Very large area (greater than 100 acres) - Most Favorable

Large area (50 - 100 acres) - More Favorable

Medium area (25 - 50 acres) - Favorable

Smaller area (10 - 25 acres) - Less Favorable

Small area (less than 10 acres) - Least Favorable, Not suppose to annex, has to be a subdivision.

E. Utility Service

Current water and sewer customer - Most Favorable

Direct access to existing water and sewer service – Most Favorable, Lines running in front of property

Direct access to existing sewer service only - More Favorable, Sewer already exist

Access to planned water and sewer service (current project) - More Favorable

Direct access to existing water service only - Favorable

Access to planned water and sewer service (less than 3 years) – Favorable, A timeframe

In serviceable sewer basin but on planned project - Less Favorable

Outside of water service area (more than .5 miles from service line) – Less Favorable

Outside serviceable sewer basin - Least Favorable

Outside of utility service agreement area - Least Favorable

F. Fire District

Inside of Mount Pleasnt's Fire District - Most Favorable

Outside of Mount Pleasant's Fire District - Least Favorable

G. Development Status

Built -out development in conformance with Town ordinances - Most Favorable

Vacant property with planned development and proper zoning - Most Favorable

Vacant property with planned development and requires rezoning (in ETJ) – Favorable

Built-out development not in conformance with Town ordinances (in ETJ) - Favorable

Vacant property with no planned development in (ETJ) - Favorable

Vacant property with no planned development (outside ETJ) - Less Favorable

Planned development that requires rezoning (outside ETJ) - Least Favorable

Platted subdivison, but not built-out, outside of ETJ - Least Favorable

Whit Moose, Jr. stated that maybe favorable is not the word we want to use. Maybe we are saying its o.k. but it's not really o.k.

Chairman Murdock asked about the financial aspects of the annexation.

- 1. Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated that Town Staff and the Planning Board shall review and give a recommendation to the Town Board on all proposed annexations.
- 2. That all petitions for voluntary annexation shall be required to be accompanied by a petition for the extension or improvement of water and wastewater utility lines and associated infrastructure to serve the proposed annexation area (if not already in place)

Petitions for utility extensions or improvements shall contain a financing plan and preliminary engineering plan

- 3. All petitions for water and/or sewer service shall be accompanied by a petition for voluntary annexation. These petitions shall be reviewed by Town Staff for compliance with the standards set forth for other annexations. All agreements have to be filed with the Register of Deeds, and referenced to the subject property.
- 4. The Town should not annex any property to which it cannot provide adequate services. The Town should set a time limit, no later than 5 years from the date of the annexation, at which time all Town services will be provided to the area as stated previously.

Proposed Policies (Land Use Related)

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated it had been a number of years since the Town has planned the Land Use Policy. He stated we need to look at the zoning map to see if we need to make any changes to those areas. We need to look at how Highway 49 will develop since most of Highway 49 is outside of Town.

The Town's development regulations and their application through the Town's zoning map, should encourage the preservation of the NC 49 corridor as a thoroughfare that will safely and efficiently move motorists to and through the Town. A strip commercial development pattern should not be allowed to emerge on the NC 49 corridor and the Town should work proactively with landowners and developers to plan for the management of access along the corridor that will minimize the number of access points to NC 49, while preserving and enhancing access for potential development.

Vagn Hansen of Benchmark stated most businesses will access from Highway 73. He stated the future health and prosperity of the Town is based partially on its ability to accommodate the changing needs of its current residents and its ability to attract new residents.

Vagn Hansen stated a more diverse housing stock will allow the Town to attract a more generationally diverse population as younger people who may not be able to afford (or want) to purchase or live in a traditional single family home would have more options for residing in the Town. He stated the primary way to facilitate the diversification of the housing stock is through changes in regulations or zoning map amendments that allow/incentivize the development of more dense housing, whether single family homes or multi-family development. Diverse housing is more attractive.

There was no action to be taken on this item, just reviewing and discussion. At the October $10^{\rm th}$ meeting we will look at the Land Use Plan Overview.

Adjournment:

Without any further discussion, Chairman Murdock entertained a motion to adjourn. Board member Shirley Freeman made a motion to adjourn. Board member James Senecal seconded the motion with all board members in favor. 5-0

hairman John Murdock III

Oy Enda Cigrk to Board Joy Eudy

